



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/533,427 03/22/00 CHIORINI

J 14014.0323U2

HM22/0705

NEEDLE AND ROSENBERG PC
THE CANDLER BUILDING
SUITE 1200
127 PEACHTREE STREET NE
ATLANTA GA 30303-1811

EXAMINER

BAKER, A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1632

DATE MAILED:

07/05/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/533,427

Applicant(s)

CHIORINI ET AL.

Examiner

Anne M. Baker

Art Unit

1632

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☒ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Application/Control Number: 09/533,427

Page 2

Art Unit: 1632

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-11 are pending in the instant application.

Oath/Declaration

The oath or declaration is defective. A new oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.67(a) identifying this application by application number and filing date is required. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

The oath or declaration is defective because:

Non-initialed and/or non-dated alterations have been made to the oath or declaration. See 37 CFR 1.52(c). See the correction to the address for Robert Kotin.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 2 and 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The claims are directed to a method of delivering a nucleic acid to a cell in a subject.

For the reasons discussed herein below, the specification fails to provide an enabling disclosure for *in vivo* applications of the claimed method.

Art Unit: 1632

Claims 1, 3-6, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for *in vitro* applications of the claimed method, does not reasonably provide enablement for *in vivo* applications of the claimed method. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The claims are directed to a method of delivering a nucleic acid to a cell. The claims encompass both *in vitro* and *in vivo* applications of the method.

The specification fails to provide an enabling disclosure for the claimed methods because the specification teaches that the only use for the methods is for gene therapy (see pp. 16-18 of specification), but the specification does not enable this use. The specification does not teach how to use the claimed methods in gene therapy applications, for the following reasons.

The claims encompass methods of gene therapy. However, gene therapy is not routinely successful. Therefore, the disclosure must enable the full scope of the claimed methods with specific guidance. However, the specification fails to teach any method for transferring a gene into a target cell and expressing that gene at a level sufficient to produce a therapeutic effect in a diseased immunocompetent animal. The specification does not provide any guidance as to the level of gene expression required, the number of transduced cells needed, the route and time course of administration, the site of administration, when, where, or for how long the therapeutic gene should be expressed, the frequency of administration of the gene therapy vector required, or in some embodiments, the intended target tissue, for treatment of any pathological condition in an immunocompetent animal. The specification also lacks any working examples showing that vectors of the type contemplated, once delivered to the appropriate site, would be expressed at a level sufficient to provide adequate product to effect the desired therapy in an immunocompetent animal. At the time the application

Art Unit: 1632

was filed, the art of administering any type of genetic expression vector to an individual so as to provide a tangible therapeutic benefit was poorly developed and unpredictable. The NIH ad hoc committee to assess the current status and promise of gene therapy reported in December 1995 that "clinical efficacy has not been definitively demonstrated at this time in any gene therapy protocol, despite anecdotal claims....," and that "significant problems remain in all basic aspects of gene therapy" (Orkin and Motulsky, p. 1). In a review article published in Scientific American in June 1997, Theodore Friedmann discusses the technical barriers which have so far prevented successful gene therapy, and states "So far, however, no approach has definitively improved the health of a single one of the more than 2,000 patients who have enrolled in gene therapy trials worldwide" (p. 96). In a review article published in Nature in September 1997, Inder Verma states "Although more than 200 clinical trials are currently underway worldwide, with hundreds of patients enrolled, there is still no single outcome that we can point to as a success story" (p. 239). The instant specification does not adequately teach one skilled in the art how to use the claimed methods for *in vivo* gene therapy. Thus, absent any showing that the claimed methods can be used in gene therapy applications to produce a therapeutic effect in an immunocompetent animal, the claims directed to *in vivo* applications of the method are not enabled by the disclosure.

The specification fails to provide an enabling disclosure for targeting appropriate cells for *in vivo* applications of the claimed method. Only general guidance is offered with regard to targeting strategies known in the art. However, the art recognizes that targeting strategies are not currently sufficient to overcome the problems known in the art. While progress has been made in recent years for *in vivo* gene transfer, vector targeting to desired tissues *in vivo* continues to be unpredictable and inefficient as supported by numerous teachings in the art. For example, Miller et al. (1995) review the types of vectors available for *in vivo* gene therapy, and conclude that "for long-term success as well as the widespread applicability of

Art Unit: 1632

human gene therapy, there will have to be advances...targeting strategies outlined in this review, which are currently only at the experimental level, will have to be translated into components of safe and highly efficient delivery systems" (page 198, column 1). Deonarain et al. (1998) indicate that one of the biggest problems hampering successful gene therapy is the "ability to target a gene to a significant population of cells and express it at adequate levels for a long enough period of time" (page 53, first paragraph). Deonarain et al. review new techniques under experimentation in the art which show promise but states that such techniques are even less efficient than viral gene delivery (see page 65, first paragraph under Conclusion section). Verma et al. (1997) review vectors known in the art for use in gene therapy and discuss problems associated with each type of vector. The teachings of Verma et al. indicate that a resolution to vector targeting has not been achieved in the art (see entire article). Verma et al. also teach that appropriate regulatory elements may improve expression, but that it is unpredictable which tissues such regulatory elements target (page 240, sentence bridging columns 2 and 3). Crystal et al. (1995) also review various vectors known in the art and indicate that "among the design hurdles for all vectors are the need to increase the efficiency of gene transfer, to increase target specificity and to enable the transferred gene to be regulated" (page 409).

In view of the quantity of experimentation necessary to determine appropriate parameters for *in vivo* applications of the claimed method to produce a therapeutic effect in a subject, and given the lack of applicable working examples demonstrating a therapeutic effect for the claimed method, the limited guidance in the specification, the broad scope of the claims, the state of the art at the time the invention was made, the limited working example for *in vivo* gene delivery, and the unpredictability for using the claimed methods in any gene therapy application to produce a therapeutic effect, undue experimentation would have been required for one skilled in the art to practice the claimed invention and to practice the claimed invention.

Art Unit: 1632

Conclusion

No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anne-Marie Baker whose telephone number is (703) 306-9155. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday and alternate Fridays from 9:30 AM to 7:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Karen Hauda, can be reached on (703) 305-6608. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-8724.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the patent analyst, Kay Pinkney, whose telephone number is (703) 305-3553.

Anne-Marie Baker, Ph.D.

Anne-Marie Baker

**ANNE-MARIE BAKER
PATENT EXAMINER**